REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33 have been amended, and Claims 43-45 have been newly added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Thus, Claims 1-45 are pending.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,825 to Underwood et al (Advisory Action, Page 3). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated earlier, all of Applicant's independent claims recite at least the following elements in various combinations: widgets, business objects, a service object manager, and a controller. These elements, as well as others, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Underwood reference.

The Advisory Action noted that Applicant raises the issues of specific terms in the limitation [that] are not found in Underwood, and that it is understood by the Examiner that the reference(s) relied upon teach each and every limitation in respect to functionality. Thus Underwood teaches the same system, method, and apparatus (Advisory Action, Page 3)

It will come as no surprise that Applicant disagrees. First, the Advisory Action overlooks or waives the requirements for a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Nowhere is it stated that "teach[ing] each and every limitation in respect to functionality" is sufficient for a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses, expressly or under principles of inherency, each and every element of a claimed invention. RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1444, 221 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 385, 388 (Fed. Cir.).

More importantly, neither Underwood nor any other cited reference "teach[es] each and every limitation in respect to functionality" of Claim 1 or any other claims. To begin, Applicant's use of the term "widget" appears to diverge from the use of that terms as understood

by the Examiner. As stated in a previous Response, widgets are described (at least) as representing properties of business objects as HTML (paragraph [0037]), automatically generating executable code (paragraph [0037]), performing data validation (paragraph [0037]), and being arranged into a panel class (paragraph [0042]), as well as having numerous other features. Claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33 have been amended to increase the visibility on this issue. Additionally, Claims 43, 44, and 45 have been newly added. Support for these new claims can be found at least in the sections cited above.

No equivalent for the claimed widget exists within Underwood, nor the Wiki definition furnished by the Examiner. The portion of the Office Action at page 3, section 4 cites Underwood's col. 41, lines 14-36 as containing subject matter which anticipates the claimed widget. However, this cited portion instead discusses a Definer, Ordered Tree Classes, and Component Classes. Despite the remark in the Advisory Action, it is still unclear how these elements relate to the claimed widget.

Applicant notes and appreciates the definition of "widget" furnished by the Examiner within the Advisory Action. Applicant expects that the Examiner is not asserting the Wikipedia definition of "widget" as prior art, particularly considering Applicant's filing date of September 30, 2003. Instead, the Examiner asserts this definition likely in an attempt at clarification. Applicant appreciates and welcomes the Examiner's attempts to clarify this issue, and (as discussed below) Applicant further encourages the Examiner to directly contact Applicant. Efforts at clarity are always beneficial to the patent process. Applicant also notes and appreciates the Examiner's earlier contacting of Applicant.

Applicant also notes, however, that the Wikipedia definition is a bit vague on detail, and does not discuss the term "widget" in the context of representing properties of business objects as HTML, automatically generating executable code, performing data validation, and being

arranged into a panel class. Accordingly, Applicant has amended various claims and added others in order to more effectively address this issue.

Additionally, the Advisory Action did not address the issue of the claimed business objects. Business objects are described (at least) as defining a user action for an application program (paragraph 0037), being a source of parameters which define user options (paragraph 0037), and having definitions which derive from service objects (paragraph 0060), as well as having numerous other features.

No equivalent for the claimed business objects exists within Underwood. The Final Office Action (page 3, section 4) cites Underwood's col. 13, lines 52-61 as containing subject matter which anticipates the claimed business objects. However, this cited portion instead discusses a Site Definer having predefined site definitions. It is unclear how these elements relate to the claimed business objects, if at all. Additionally, the claimed business objects are not predefined, but instead derive from service objects 102 which do not come into existence until a developer creates them (paragraph 0060) and thus cannot be "predefined".

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has other deficiencies, including at least a lack of anticipation of the claimed service object manager, and also of the controller.

Each of the other independent claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33 recite at least some of the features described above. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims are deficient, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Each of the dependent claims depends, directly or indirectly, on one of claims 1, 2, 12, 13, 23, and 33, and therefore incorporates by dependency each of the features described above that distinguishes the base independent claim from Underwood. Therefore, each of the dependent claims is allowable over Underwood for the same reasons given above for claims 1, 2,

12, 13, 23, and 33. Further, the dependent claims recite features that independently render them patentable.

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by e-mail or telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application. Additionally, Applicant further provides an Applicant-Initiated Interview Request form.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: February 5, 2008   /ChristopherMTanner#41518/
            Christopher M. Tanner
            Reg. No. 41,518

ctanner@hptb-law.com
2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076